



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,808	08/17/2000	Marlene Belfort	454311-2201.1	6356

20999 7590 08/05/2003

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

NAVARRO, ALBERT MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/641,808

Applicant(s)
Belfort et al

Examiner
Mark Navarro

Art Unit
1645



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 34-72 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-33, in Paper No. 8, received May 20, 2003 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that even with patentably distinct inventions, restriction is not required unless one of the following reasons appear (MPEP 808.02): Separate classification, separate status in the art or different field of search. Applicants further assert that those of skill in the art accept that polypeptides and the DNA that encodes them are inextricably linked in the practice of all biotechnological inventions. Thus, most of the literature (including patents) in the field of biotechnology, including the field of inteins, describes both polypeptides and the DNA sequences that encode them together and in relation to one another. Therefore, the search and examination of Groups I and II is likely to be co-extensive and, in any event, would involve such interrelated art that the search and examination of both Groups can be made without undue burden. This is not found persuasive because it is the Examiner's position that the search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious any of the other groups. As shown by the MPEP manual of classification, DNA is classified in Group 536, subclass 23.1, while polypeptides are classified in Group 530, subclass 350 (Satisfying MPEP requirement 808.02 as argued by Applicants).

Art Unit: 1645

Clearly a patent search requires separate searches and is not coextensive. Furthermore, Applicant's are respectfully directed to *In re Duel* 34 USPQ2d 1210 (CAFC 1995), which clearly shows that a protein can be anticipated by a reference which discloses that protein, but it does not necessarily anticipate or render obvious the DNA encoding the protein.

Consequently, claims 1-72 are pending in the instant application, of which claims 34-72 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

This requirement is deemed proper and accordingly made FINAL.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 11-33 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend upon another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 11-33 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Art Unit: 1645

Claims 1-10 recite a non-naturally occurring intein or cleavage or cleavage and splicing moiety having splicing activity and/or controllable cleavage activity.

The specification and claims do not indicate what distinguishing attributes are shared by the members of the genus. Thus, the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, an “intein or cleavage or cleavage and splicing moiety” alone is insufficient to describe the genus. Thus, Applicant’s have not described a function which is shared by the “intein or cleavage and splicing moiety” which would adequately describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The protein itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Applicants are directed to the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 “Written Description” Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999.

Art Unit: 1645

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Comb et al.

The claims are directed to a non-naturally occurring intein or cleavage or cleavage and splicing moiety having splicing activity and/or controllable cleavage activity.

Comb et al (US Patent Number 5,834,247) disclose of modified proteins comprising a controllable intervening protein sequence (CIVPS) and a target protein, the CIVPS being capable of excision by protein splicing, or cleavage in the absence of splicing, under predetermined conditions, e.g., increase in temperature, changes in pH conditions, unblocking of amino acid residues by photolysis, dephosphorylation, deglycosylation, treatment with chemical reagents exposure to peptide activators or inhibitors which block or induce splicing or cleavage. (See columns 8-12 and claims).

Art Unit: 1645

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Navarro, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3225. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 AM - 6:00 PM. The examiner can be reached on alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Lynette Smith can be reached at (703) 308-3909.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1645 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1645 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the official Gazette 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CMI Fax Center number is (703) 308-4242.



Mark Navarro

Primary Examiner

August 4, 2003